

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/518,635	SHIMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jonathan Dunlap	2855	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Non-Final

 (1) Jonathan Dunlap.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Steven Gruskin (Representative).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 5 July 2007
**Time:** 1:53
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**
*Claims 7-8, 103(a)*
**Claims discussed:**

3-8

**Prior art documents discussed:**

N/A

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner initiated a telephonic interview with Steven Gruskin to discuss claims 7-8 as being product-by-process claims. Claims 3-6 were amended in a response filed on June 7, 2007 and would have been allowed in the next Office Action. To advance prosecution, the Examiner suggested that more structural details from the method claims of 3-6 should be included in the product-by-process claims of 7-8 so as to place the entire application in condition for allowance. The Examiner agreed to review a set of drafted claims for a possible Examiner's Amendment at a later date.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/518,635	SHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan Dunlap	2855	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Non-Final

 (1) Jonathan Dunlap.

 (3) Mark Davis (Representative).

 (2) Andrew Baca (Representative).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 July 2007
**Time:** 12:05 pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

22-27

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/PE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant submitted a set of drafted claims to be entered via an Examiner's Amendment. The Examiner contacted Applicant's representative to verify that the amendment could be entered.